

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al., on behalf
of themselves and as
representatives of the class.

NO. C 94-2307 CW
ORDER REGARDING
MONITORING

Plaintiffs,

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Governor of
the State of California;
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION;
MICHAEL MINOR, Director of the
Division of Juvenile Justice; DR.
JEFFREY A. BEARD, Secretary of
the California Department of
Corrections and Rehabilitation;
JENNIFER SHAFFER, the Executive
Officer of the Board of Parole
Hearings; DIANA TOCHE, Acting
Director of the Division of
Correctional Health Care
Services; CHRIS MEYER, Director
of the Division of Facility
Planning, Construction and
Management; KATHLEEN DICKINSON,
Director of Adult Institutions;
and DAN STONE, Director of
Division of Adult Parole
Operations,

Defendants.

On February 4, 2013, the Court directed the parties to file a brief addressing whether it would be appropriate for the Office of Inspector General (OIG) to play a role in monitoring state prisons in this action for compliance with the rights of inmates with disabilities. Docket No. 2231. Pursuant to the Court's direction, the parties filed briefs addressing this topic. Docket

1 Nos. 2252, 2290, 2291.¹

2 Having reviewed the written submissions by the parties and
3 their oral presentations at the hearing, the Court declines to
4 establish OIG monitoring at this time.² In their briefs and in
5 previous status reports, the parties raised issues about the
6 ongoing monitoring that is taking place in this case pursuant to
7 the Court's prior orders. At this time, the Court directs the
8 parties to meet and confer, with the assistance of the Court's
9 expert as needed, on how to resolve these issues and improvements
10 that might be made on the monitoring process.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12
13 Dated: 6/3/2013


CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 ¹ Defendants move to strike Plaintiffs' brief for violation
of the ten-page page limit set by the Court. Docket No. 2295. At
the hearing held on May 16, 2013, Defendants declined to pursue
the motion. Accordingly, the motion is DENIED as moot (Docket No.
2295).

26
27
28 ² Plaintiffs' administrative motion to submit supplemental
evidence is DENIED as moot (Docket No. 2323).